

Date: Nov. 13, 2006

To: Senator Michelle Vachris, Chair (SEC)
Senator Eric Duskin, Member
Senator Jean Filetti, Member
Senator Harry Grau, Member
Senator Nicole Guajardo, Member (SEC)

From: Tracey Schwarze, Faculty Senate President

Subj: Priority Advisory Council Charge

Thank you all for agreeing to serve on the Priority Advisory Council established by the Senate at its 11-3 meeting. In accordance with that discussion, this is the charge to your group. Your first report will be at the Jan. 19, 2007, Senate meeting, so that Michelle and I can take the Senate's actions on your recommendations forward to the Budget Advisory Council in February.

- 1) Examine and prioritize the following initiatives passed by the Senate in the past 18 months. I have provided any cost information available that I have received from the Provost.
- 2) Codify your existence for the 2007-08 Handbook. Please refer to the 11-3 minutes (section V) for the basics.

Initiatives to be prioritized (in no particular order)

- A. Budget request of \$750/year for the Faculty Senate: to pay Faculty Senate of VA dues and cover travel to meetings, etc.
- B. Increase sabbaticals from 4 to 10/year. Approximate individual sabbatical cost: \$9,000. Passed 1/06.
- C. Shifting faculty to 3-4 load. This 4/06 resolution supported the shift in 07-08; budgetary considerations now make a staged approach more likely http://facultysenate.cnu.edu/05_06/resolutions/5.doc. According to the University's 6-Year Plan, all faculty shall be on a 3-4 load by 2011-2012. Cost information: \$2250/course (in adjunct wages); can be split between adjunct wages and increased class size. I will have an updated chart for you not later than the 12-1 Senate meeting from which costs for staged plans can be estimated.
- D. Junior faculty research leave. Passed 1/06. The Provost disagrees with this proposal in concept (see below). It has also been overtaken by the new proposals to stage the implementation of the 3-4 load.
- E. Increase faculty development grant funding from \$30,000 to \$60,000/year.
- F. Chair compensation proposals. Passed 4/06. Note: the President and Provost do not agree that all chairs should be compensated equally without regard to the size of their departments. They believe department size is an important consideration in the compensation of chairs. I asked the Council of University Chairs to revisit

the proposal with this objection in mind, and their response is attached. Cost information is also below.

Item B background:

05-06 Senate Proposal:

Sabbaticals

- Increase the number immediately to 10 and eventually to 27 (10% of our target faculty).
- Give preference to scholarship over development.
- Expect faculty members to take a sabbatical leave on average every 10 years.
- Establish a minimum of 7 years between sabbatical leaves.
- Fund sabbatical leaves at 100 percent salary for 1 semester or 60 percent salary for 2 semesters.
- Require faculty to commit to remain at CNU for a minimum of 2 years after returning from sabbatical leave.
- Expect faculty to submit a report on their activities along with the product of those activities (article, book, play etc.) where appropriate to their academic dean within 1 semester of returning from sabbatical.

From the Provost:

CLASSIC SABBATICALS: Since there is a new edition of the Handbook each year, I think that Handbook language should speak to things as they are in the year of applicability and not in terms of aspirations for future years; so I would deal here with the question of 10 for 07-08 rather than that of 27 for some unspecified time down the road. At present adjunct rates, the marginal cost (in wages and FICA) of one sabbatical is about \$9,000. I believe that this year we have four; so going to ten would raise the annual cost of sabbaticals from about \$36,000 to about \$90,000 -- an increase of some \$54,000 annually. Can we find that amount? Almost certainly we can. But be mindful of priorities: It is roughly 25% of the amount I estimated last year was needed to implement the 4-3 teaching load (under the scenario where the impact was divided equally between growth in adjunct utilization and growth in average class size). I think too that if we opt for Handbook language to this effect in the 07-08 edition that it should be qualified in some way in terms of the quality of the proposals for sabbatical which are funded. In particular, if there are only five applications for sabbaticals which, through its sanctioned processes, the institution deems suitable for funding, then we should not be obliged (or even feel obliged) to award ten. I think that some kind of language which protects us in that way needs to be included.

Item D background:

05-06 Senate Proposal:

Junior Faculty Research Leave

- Allow faculty to take JFR leave in their 4th or 5th year.

- Fund JFR leaves at 100 percent salary with a 2 course reduced load
- (and no more than a three day per week teaching schedule) for one academic year or 1 semester with no teaching duties.
- Establish that a minimum of 7 years must elapse before next (sabbatical) leave.
- Require faculty to commit to remain at CNU for a minimum of 2 years after returning from JFR leave.
- Expect faculty members to submit a report on their activities alongwith the product of those activities (article, book, play etc.) where appropriate to their academic dean within 1 semester of returning from JFR leave.

From the Provost:

JUNIOR SABBATICALS: The potential incremental costs of this program could easily exceed the ones mentioned above; but my primary reservations about it are not about costs. I am assuming that the main purpose of this program is to permit probationary faculty to enhance their chances of a successful tenure candidacy (at least as far as research is concerned). I doubt that this is actually in the University's best interests. Let us suppose that the program, by this standard, was an unqualified success; i.e., that it created some significant number of successful tenure candidacies which, in its absence, would have been unsuccessful. Then the situation which it has brought into being is an increased cadre of tenured faculty who apparently can create the promise of a suitably productive scholarly career only under circumstances of teaching load, etc., which are different from those which they will actually experience at CNU in their post-tenure lives here. Worse, I predict that with a program of junior sabbaticals in place, the institutional expectations for scholarly achievement at tenure time will rise accordingly -- and not without reason. I would much rather see an expansion of summer research stipends for junior faculty so that they can more easily devote their summers to their scholarship than is now the case. Unlike the junior sabbaticals, this would create a situation more (as opposed to less) like that which will obtain in the post-tenure years, because an individual's annual base salary rate will, in fact, rise over time -- well beyond the difference made possible by the summer stipends. At the bottom line, I think that the concept of junior sabbaticals is founded on a false premise, viz., that when a tenure candidacy fails for want of adequate scholarly productivity, it is because the University has done too little to foster scholarly productivity on the candidate's part. I would maintain that if the candidate's seriousness of purpose regarding scholarship is commensurate with a successful tenure candidacy, then there is ample opportunity (in six 12-month years) in the absence of junior sabbaticals to establish the necessary record in this regard. [But, I could be wrong!]

Item F background:

05-06 Senate Proposal: Chair Compensation

http://faculty senate.cnu.edu/05_06/misc/chairsummarynew.doc

http://faculty senate.cnu.edu/05_06/misc/chairnew.doc

From the Provost (excerpted email from R. Summerville to T. Schwarze, and sent from T. Schwarze on 10-2-06 to H. Cones, Chair of Council of University Chairs):

The Provost is in full agreement that chairs are in need of more compensation than what is presently being offered. He offered the following calculations regarding the cost of the recommendations as they now stand:

Release Time:

- *Currently budgeted LHEs for chair release: 168*
- *Proposed budgeted LHEs for chair releases (giving all chairs 6 hrs release): 246*
- *Proposed net increase in LHE cost: \$58,500*

Stipend Increase:

- *Current summer stipend expenditure: \$68,500*
- *Proposed stipend expenditure (1/9 base salary): \$162,000*
- *Proposed net increase in stipend cost: \$93,500*

Total Proposal Cost: \$152,000

Finally, the Provost made clear again that he agrees with the need to more adequately compensate chairs for their hard work. He also agrees with the notion that there is a baseline of work that is constant for all chairs, though he did disagree with the notion that chairing a department of say, 15 or more faculty members is the equivalent of chairing a department of say, 4 faculty members.

Response from the Council of University Chairs from its 11-26 meeting to the Senate's 10-2 request to prioritize parts of this proposal:

The chairs recommend that the Senate continue to pursue the chair compensation question. The chairs further recommend that ALL chairs receive a two course load reduction for performing chair duties. Rationale: The workload for chairs is ever increasing in quantity and quality. Chairs have become much more than "pencil pushers" and the modern CNU chair must be a LEADER, mentoring faculty and students and effectively leading their department to a place of prominence in the University. As leaders, chairs are required to assess faculty performance as part of the annual evaluation process and most chairs feel that they spend more time in a leadership role than they do in the administrative role. To be an effective leader takes time—a great deal of time—and all chairs, regardless of department size, feel pressured by deadlines and work loads. At a minimum, all chairs need a two course release, and larger departments would greatly profit from an associate chair. Additionally, chairs of all departments have found that the rigors of chairing and doing for others have left little time for themselves and their own classes and professional development. The chairs also recommend that a phase-in financial compensation package be pursued immediately, starting with an increase in summer pay for chair duties. Rationale: Although a previously stated major concern from the chairs, at least four chairs received a CUT in summer compensation for 2006, without explanation or rationale, and all chairs received a contract that was much more restrictive than past years.